

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 4-6, 8, and 12 have been amended. The specification has been amended to correct certain informalities. Accordingly, claims 1-12 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 12 are independent claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figures 6, 14, and 16, and at page 13, lines 6-14 of the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Claim Objection

In the Office Action, claim 4 was objected to because the examiner asserts that “a switching output current” should recite “a switching output circuit”.

Claim 4 has been amended to recite “a switching output circuit.” This amendment is made for the sole purpose of correction. This amendment is not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is intended. Therefore Applicants do not intend to relinquish any subject matter by this amendment. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4, as amended, overcomes the stated objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection for claim 4.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The examiner asserts that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the recited limitation “the switching output circuit” in line 1.

Claim 4 has been amended as described above, and the amendment to claim 4 provides antecedent basis for claim 5. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph in view of the amendment to claim 4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 5.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,262,699 issued to Suzuki, *et al.* ("Suzuki").

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection improper.

Suzuki fails to disclose every feature of claim 1 as amended. Claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*:

wherein at least one of the X driver and the Y driver comprises a plurality of driving circuits commonly connected to a reset circuit, each driving circuit corresponding to one of the plurality of XY electrode pair groups. (emphasis added)

The examiner asserts that Suzuki discloses "a plurality of driving circuits" at Figure 3. Office Action, page 3. However, Suzuki fails to disclose "a plurality of driving circuits commonly connected to a reset circuit." On the basis of Suzuki's col. 5, lines 15-26, the examiner concludes that since "the Y driver provides a reset pulse, ... there must be a reset circuit present." More specifically, Suzuki's col. 5, lines 15-26 indicate that Y-electrode driver 80A and Y-electrode driver 80B each apply reset pulses to different groups of electrodes. However, since Suzuki fails to disclose that Y-electrode driver 80A and Y-electrode driver 80B are

“commonly connected to a reset circuit,” Suzuki fails to disclose at least these features of claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 1. Claims 2-3 and 8-10 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Suzuki in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0057858 applied for by Lee, *et al.* (“Lee”).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over Suzuki, and Lee fails to cure the deficiencies of Suzuki noted above with regard to claim 1. Hence, claims 4-7 are allowable at least because they depend from an allowable claim 1.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Suzuki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,091,380 issued to Hashimoto, *et al.* (“Hashimoto”).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over Suzuki, and Hashimoto fails to cure the deficiencies of Suzuki noted above with regard to claim 1. Hence, claim 11 is allowable at least because it depends from an allowable claim 1.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Lee in view of Suzuki.

Assuming *arguendo* that the references may be combined and a reasonable expectation of success exists, the combined references do not disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Specifically, Suzuki and Lee, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose every feature of claim 12 as amended. Claim 12 as amended recites, *inter alia*:

wherein at least one of the X driver and the Y driver comprises a plurality of driving circuits commonly connected to a reset circuit, each driving circuit corresponding to one of the plurality of XY electrode pair groups. (emphasis added)

For at least the reasons asserted above with respect to claim 1, Suzuki fails to disclose at least these features. Further, Lee fails to cure the deficiencies of Suzuki.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 12. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 12 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: May 11, 2007

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/WMH/kbs